DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 244 JC 770 083

TITLE	State University Trustee Committee on the Special Problems of the Community Colleges. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Board of Trustees.
PUB DATE	Feb 76
NOTE	57p.; Some tables are cropped at margins
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Competitive Selection; Educational Finance; Educational Opportunities; *Educational Problems; *Financial Problems; *Junior Colleges; Open Enrollment; Part Time Students; Presidents; Program Costs; *Program Evaluation; State Aid; State Boards of Education; *State School District Relationship; State Standards; *Statewide Planning; Trustees; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS	*New York; Presidential Search Process; Program Approval

ABSTRACT

This report reviews the major problems facing New York community colleges and presents the recommendations of a Committee of the State University of New York Board of Trustees. The nature and range of problems were clustered in three areas: provision of adequate funding and opportunities for optimum resource utilization; clarification of the roles and interrelationships of local sponsors, local trustees, and the state; and accountability in programmatic areas. In light of the fiscal exigiencies faced by the state and of the needs of the community colleges, the Committee recommended: (1) that programmatic funding recognizing differential program costs be adopted to provide equitable resource allocation and improved management planning; (2) that guidelines for program approval and retention be developed and implemented; (3) that Educational Opportunity Programs be reaffirmed and strengthened; (4) that no new regulations governing terms of service for local trustees be adopted; (5) that guidelines for community college presidential search committees be established; (6) that a management information system for collective bargaining be developed; (7) that an equitable tuition policy for part-time students be established; and (8) that regional admissions policies for high demand restricted-access programs be considered. State support formulas, a draft mission statement, guidelines for the presidential search process, and community college statistical data are appended. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134244

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

STATE UNIVERSITY TRUSTEE COMMITTEE

ON THE

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Submitted to

State University of New York
Board of Trustees

February 1976

JC 770 083

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Committee wishes to thank Dr. Richard Grego, Mr. Dana McLymond, Dr. James McVean, Mrs. Belle Simon and Dr. Nathan Weiner for ably presenting the views of their constituencies. Their insights were most helpful to the work of the Committee. In addition, the Committee wishes to thank Mr. Henrik N. Dullea, Mrs. Sandra Mardon, Mrs. Joyce Villa and the staff of the Office for Community Colleges for their assistance.

Committee Members:

Darwin J. Wales, Chairman
Robert H. Kirkpatrick
Mrs. Bronson A. Quackenbush
John A. Roosevelt
Mrs. Walter Thayer
James J. Warren

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purposes and Objectives of the Committee

B. Methodology

II. SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A. Finance

B. Governance

C. Program Approval and Retention

D. Assessment of Accountability

E. Equal Opportunity Programs

F. Terms of Local Trustees

G. Capital Chargeback Usage

H. Administrative Actions

I. Items for Future Attention

1. Mandatory Service Area Policy

2. Regional Admissions to High Demand Programs

3. Center on Community College Studies

4. Tuition

III. CONCLUSION

APPENDIX

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purposes and Objectives of the Committee

In establishing community colleges in New York State, the original goal of the framers of Article 126 was to combine the best features of local initiative and state coordination. The growth and vitality of these institutions over the past twenty-eight years bears testimony that in the past these arrangements worked reasonably well.

However, it is also clear that significant signs of stress have begun to emerge in recent years. In large measure, these conditions can be traced to both the increased complexity of the community college mission and the growing fiscal pressures upon both the state and the local sponsor. These pressures have increased dramatically in recent days, and no relief appears to be in sight. Other factors such as enrollment uncertainties, relationships with other institutions, both public and private, and the changing nature of higher education in general have also contributed to posing a serious set of problems for these institutions.

At various times, specific attempts have been made to respond to a number of these issues through the use of consultants, task forces, advisory committees and legislative bodies. Still, perhaps due to the highly divergent and at times conflicting interests of the colleges, the local sponsors, and the state, long-term change, particularly in the areas of funding and governance, has been difficult to achieve. As a result, areas of concern have remained.

The Trustee Committee on the Special Problems of the Community Colleges was established by the State University Trustees, upon the recommendation of Chancellor Boyer, in recognition of this situation and of the unique status of these institutions. The objective of this Committee from the start has not been directed toward duplicating such previous efforts as The Future of the Public Two-Year Colleges in New York State, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company, September 1969, and Report of the Task Force on Community Colleges, October 1973. Rather, its focus has been on examining several major substantive concerns, identifying specific issues within the context of these concerns and proposing recommendations for meeting these challenges.

B. Methodology

The Committee held a series of meetings in executive session between January and April of 1975. Working with staff briefing papers and inviting input from representatives of the Association of Boards and Councils, the Faculty Council for Community Colleges, the Association of Presidents of Public Community Colleges and the Student Assembly, the Committee attempted to identify both the nature and the range of the major problems confronting community colleges.

Three basic themes increasingly occupied the attention of the Committee:

(1) Provision of adequate funding and opportunities for optimum utilization of resources.

(2) Clarification of the roles and interrelationships of the local sponsor, the local board of trustees and the state.

(3) Development of a series of recommendations leading to improved accountability in programmatic areas.

In particular, considerable attention was given to the question of assuring and improving programmatic quality on a statewide basis. As a result, an open meeting was held on the general subject of quality on May 1, 1975 with invitations extended to the membership of the four constituent groups. The purpose of that meeting was to engage in an exchange of ideas about the quality issue as well as other matters of concern in order to aid the Committee in its deliberations. That meeting did provide such a forum and was most helpful to the Committee.

On September 23, a meeting was held in executive session to consider specific recommendations for action. These suggestions were then distributed at the October 17-19, 1975 Meeting of the Association of Boards and Councils of Two-Year Colleges of the State University of New York for discussion purposes.

As a result of the ongoing deliberations of the Committee, going back to January of 1975 and the frank and full interchange of ideas among the various constituencies since then, the Committee has prepared an issue-oriented report along with proposed recommendations for action.

II. SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A. Finance

The current fiscal crisis of the State is the most severe since the days of the Great Depression. It is clear that the fiscal resources of this State are finite and that the days of ever-increasing state support levels are past. Optimum utilization of available resources must have the highest priority in the days ahead. Community colleges, like all other public institutions, will be confronted with major problems of funding. In 1975-76, under the current Formula on Limitations, state aid is estimated to be 37.4% of net operating budgets statewide. In 1976-77, under a modified formula proposed in the Executive Budget and shown in Figure 1 of the Appendix, state aid is expected to decline dramatically to 32.6%. The impact of the proposals made in that budget is shown in Table 1.

If the present formula were to be maintained for fiscal 1976-77, state aid for community colleges is estimated at $96,142,000, a modest increase of 5.8% over 1975-76 levels. The adoption of the Executive Budget, on the other hand, would reduce state aid to $86,663,000 or an absolute dollar decline from 1975-76 and a reduction of 9.9% from continuation of the current formula for 1976-77. The magnitude of these reductions will, in all probability, pose serious hardships for many institutions in effectively serving their clientele. Beyond this, the proposed new formula, by eliminating increments for the percent of instructional support and sponsor effort will impact most

heavily on those institutions which attempted to be responsive to state priorities.

Most importantly, however, the current Executive Budget provides that state support levels be tied to specific enrollment estimates without the possibility of deficiency appropriations for unanticipated enrollments. The dollar savings from such an approach are unlikely to be significant while the principle of open access is central to the community college concept. Any acceptance of that premise, even on a one-year basis, will, in effect, deal a hard blow to full opportunity in its broadly accepted meaning. This State has been a national leader in its commitment to the guarantee of at least the first two years of post secondary education to all citizens. The road to wide acceptance of that concept has been long and hard. When the achievement of that goal in this system is nearly a reality, a retreat by the State from its long-time commitment would be a great loss. It will not be a service to the future interests of this State to translate diminished resources into diminished opportunities for its citizens. Today's lost opportunities can easily become tomorrow's State burdens.

While present funding concerns must necessarily occupy center stage this year, basic questions of a long-term approach to the allocation of available State resources remain and still must be considered. The first step in this consideration necessarily starts with the Formula on Limitations. The present formula has been criticized on the following grounds:

(1) Its across the board limitations do not adequately

recognize differential costs of technical programs and, therefore, encourage tendencies toward lower cost programs. As a result, it is unfair to those institutions with a program mix weighted toward the technical side.

(2) It does not adequately encourage the fulfillment of desirable programmatic and managerial objectives, especially as based on a scheme of priorities.

(3) It pays insufficient attention to the impact of inflation.

(4) The support formula has resulted in widely varying state support to individual colleges.

As a result of these criticisms, there has been considerable support for basic changes in the support formula both in the Legislature and elsewhere. In response to a legislative mandate of 1973, the State University Trustees proposed a comprehensive legislative package and submitted those recommendations to the Governor's Office.

Basically, that legislation proposed both enrichment and modification of the Formula on Limitations over the near term and a move to differential funding based on programmatic costs by major field of study over the long term.

Several of the near-term recommendations for modifications of the Formula on Limitations were, in fact, adopted for the 1974-75 fiscal year. The most significant of these were the elimination of the so-called "super-maximum" limitation of $35 and an

upward shift in the basic aid support levels. The long-term proposal for a change to programmatic funding did not receive executive support. This method would recognize differentials in program costs, changes in statewide and regional economic conditions, differential costs of large and small institutions and costs associated with the provision of remedial, counseling and tutorial services, etc.

In January of 1975, the State University Trustees again submitted a comprehensive legislative proposal to the Governor including the concept of programmatic funding. It was suggested as part of this effort that programmatic funding can be accomplished within the context of available resources provided that institutions are guaranteed a save-harmless provision.

Once again, several of the near-term proposals, including an increase in the stipend for service to the disadvantaged, and 40% or 33 1/3% of rental costs for physical space, were adopted while the long-term proposal was not acted upon. At the same time, eligibility for the increment for minimum student-faculty ratio was skewed upward from 17 to 1 to 17.5 to 1. The concept of program funding has once again been forwarded to the Governor. However, it must be recognized that the Division of the Budget is now on record in opposition to allocation along programmatic lines. Their view is that the present formula provides an adequate mechanism for achieving both educational and management goals. An additional negative factor is that the present economic climate has increased resistance to state support not tied to specific dollar amounts.

In view of this, the Committee has examined several alternative avenues of action:

(1) In view of the absence of action over the past two years and of the continued opposition of the Division of the Budget, accept the premise that programmatic funding will not become a viable alternative in the foreseeable future. Continue support toward at least maintenance of the current formula for 1976-77 and for enrichment over the long term.

(2) Propose the development of a new funding mechanism.

(3) Continue to work for maintenance of the current formula for 1976-77 and continue support of the proposed legislation moving toward implementation of programmatic funding for 1977-78 in the hope that this concept will remain viable. At the same time, establish guidelines assuring the continuation of the present costing effort at community colleges despite the absence of supportive legislation.

Proposed Recommendation

The Committee remains firmly committed to the concept of Full Opportunity and believes that short-term fiscal exigencies can be solved without infringing on that goal. In terms of the allocation process, the Committee recognizes both current fiscal realities and the prospects for changes in the formula over the long term. Still, it remains the view of this Committee that a shift

to programmatic funding will not only provide a more equitable and realistic method of allocating available resources but will also have significant subsidiary effects in terms of providing opportunities for improved management planning. Legislation to that end has been submitted to the Governor's Office, and it is recommended that option three be selected.

B. Governance

In any discussion of governance, the central issue must necessarily focus on the nature of the roles and interrelationships of each of the constituencies--the local sponsor, the State acting through the State University Trustees, the local board of trustees, the students, faculty and college administration. Clearly, each has different goals and objectives which need to be considered and evaluated in accordance with the long-term interests of the institution itself and of its function as a participant in a statewide system.

It has been widely suggested both in the Legislature and elsewhere that fundamental changes in governance are necessary to maintain the educational integrity of the community colleges. A number of alternatives have been put forward, including integration within the State University system, a separate state board for community colleges, locally elected boards of trustees with taxing powers, and incorporated local boards of trustees. No clear consensus has emerged for movement in any specific direction, and there is little enthusiasm at the state level for the increased support levels that would undoubtedly be required. The Committee, therefore, believes that modifications of the present governance

arrangements more clearly defining the role of each of the constituent participants and the limitations on those roles would aid significantly in solving present problems while maintaining the best features of local initiative and state coordination without substantial increases in state costs.

Perhaps one of the most enduring and troublesome problems in the area of governance has been the ability of the local sponsor to select either Plan A, Plan B, or Plan C of the Education Law as the mechanism for the administration of the financial affairs of community colleges. In fact, Plan B has never been used. In practice, the selection of Plan A has often come to involve the sponsor in decisions at the heart of the educational process. Certainly, it is both the right and the responsibility of the local sponsor, as the authorized taxing agency to require fiscal accountability and to retain budgetary approval. To do less would involve a neglect of their duties. The Committee firmly believes, however, that a mechanism should be adopted which would retain the rights and responsibilities of the sponsor while providing for the flexibility required to maintain educational integrity. Current laws should be amended to eliminate present options and substitute such a mechanism.

Proposed Recommendation

The present Code of Standards should be carefully reviewed in order to clarify the roles of the various constituencies. A task force for this purpose has been appointed. It is hoped that any proposed modifications can be ready for action by the State

University Trustees in 1976. As part of this review, the missions and objectives of these institutions should be clearly identified and supported for inclusion in the Master Plan. A draft mission statement has been prepared and is attached in Appendix I. Perhaps most importantly, procedures should be developed for ongoing review of the Code. The Committee also strongly supports the legislation which has been proposed and submitted to the Governor's Office mandating a "modified Plan C" as the vehicle for the administration of community colleges.

C. Program Approval and Retention

The recognition that the days of ever-expanding resources are past has brought with it an increased need for a reexamination of all aspects of the educational process. Perhaps nowhere is that reexamination more difficult or more necessary than in the area of academic programs. The desirability for careful analysis at the state level as part of the approval process for new programs has been widely accepted. This process is both clear and well-defined.

The development of a similar process for program retention purposes carries with it the implicit concept of ongoing program review. Such a review involves basic questions of the degree and level of institutional automony and the rights and responsibilities of a state level coordinating agency. Beyond this, the establishment of criteria for determining the retention or excision of various programs is most difficult indeed. For example, there has been increasing criticism that many educational institutions continue to train graduates for occupations in which there are

limited job opportunities. The difficulties of predicing manpower needs two years hence and of responding quickly to shifts in local job cpportunities are almost overwhelming. Above all, there is a recognition that the student has the right in a democracy to choose his own life direction.

Overriding all these considerations, however, is the basic question of the quality of the educational product. If this quality varies among institutions, then students are not being provided with equal educational opportunity on a statewide basis. It has been argued that ongoing program review conducted at local campuses under State University guidelines is both an appropriate and a necessary tool to guarantee such quality. Therefore, despite the difficulties, the Committee believes that the development of guidelines for program retention is a basic and vital matter. Clearly, there must be a cooperative effort between local campuses and the Central Administration to assure success in this area. Currently, the Office of Academic Programs is in the process of developing comprehensive guidelines for both program approval and retention. The Committee supports this effort.

Proposed Recommendation

It is recommended that guidelines for program approval and retention at community colleges be developed and implemented.

D. Assessment of Accountability

The implementation of Full Opportunity Programs has created expanded educational opportunities for a large segment of the population in this State. Today, with the exception of Erie and Nassau, every community college participates in the Full Opportunity

Program. The continued support for that effort has been reaffirmed in an earlier section of this Report. However, it has become increasingly clear that opening the college door to all comers does not automatically guarantee real opportunity. All too often, the student finds that without the necessary skills and, more importantly, without adequate institutional support services, guaranteed access can soon become an opportunity for failure.

In developing the criteria for State University Trustees' approval of community college Full Opportunity Plans, attention was necessarily directed toward the implementation aspects of such plans. Most institutions have now passed that important preliminary state and increasingly, the quarterly report process has become pro forma in nature and is used primarily as a mechanism for funding. The time has now come for more in-depth reports on a less frequent basis.

Many institutions recognize the need for appropriate student support services and have met this challenge in progressive and innovative ways. Nevertheless, there are significant variations among the services provided and, once again, the accident of geography plays a vital role in determining a student's chance for success. In order to fully provide opportunity on a statewide basis, support services must be maintained at certain minimum levels, and statewide standards for such support services need to be developed as the result of a cooperative effort between the colleges and the Central Staff.

Beyond this, a procedure for gaining more insight into the institutions' ability to meet the needs of the student would be

most helpful both to the local institution and to the system at large.

Attrition and retention studies are vital barometers for institutional self-evaluation not only in indicating what is being done, but also in providing parameters as to what can be done. Such surveys are now being conducted on an annual basis, and their initial findings have been most helpful.

Studies of outcomes including such areas as transfer, placement, and perhaps most importantly, student self-satisfaction, are strong indicators as to the need for future directions and reevaluation.

The State has clear responsibilities for the establishment of minimum standards in order to assure equality of opportunity. However, the flexibility and autonomy of local institutions must also be preserved within the context of meeting these standards. In the same way, information on a system-wide basis is needed for effective state planning.

Proposed Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the present reporting system for full-opportunity institutions be modified with more in-depth reports at yearly intervals. In addition, minimum statewide standards for student support services should be developed as a result of joint discussions with the campuses. In order to aid statewide planning needs, studies on transfer, placement and student self-satisfaction should be initiated. In this regard, every effort should be expended to insure the use of current reporting arrangements.

E. Educational Opportunity Programs

The University has long been committed to reaching out to new clientele whose opportunities have been previously limited because of educational and economic disadvantages. The introduction of the Full Opportunity Program itself was an affirmation of this concept. Minority group enrollment has been and continues to be an important segment of this new clientele. In the fall of 1974, minority group enrollment constituted 7% of all full-time credit course students at community colleges. It is hoped that efforts will continue toward increasing this percentage in the months ahead.

Currently, educationally and economically disadvantaged students are provided necessary services and programs through a variety of methods, including basic financial aid packages, remedial and developmental services, the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), and Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC).

The primary objective of the Educational Opportunity Program is to help provide services to promising students who are either high school graduates or who have achieved equivalency diplomas. Under this program, a dollar amount for each EOP student is allocated to participating community colleges. The dollar amount is variable depending on family finances and other considerations. Currently, twenty-five community colleges participate in this program and it is hoped that, in the future, full participation can be achieved.

The Educational Opportunity Centers are designed to expand access to community colleges and other university campuses by

offering academic remediation, career counseling, diagnostic testing and college referral services to educationally disadvantaged students. There have been suggestions that many of the services currently provided by Educational Opportunity Centers can be assumed by urban community colleges, utilizing EOP/FOP funding arrangements. It has also been suggested that outreach-intake services to the disadvantaged in inner cities and other population centers can be provided by community colleges through special funding arrangements for mobile units, satellite centers and other necessities.

The Committee believes that incorporation of Educational Opportunity Centers within local community colleges wherever possible, will provide an effective delivery system for these services. However, it is also believed that fiscal arrangements must be both detailed and clarified before any such arrangements are made.

Proposed Recommendation

The Committee recommends the reaffirmation of the principle of reaching out to the educationally and economically disadvantaged. It further recommends that efforts continue to achieve full participation in the Educational Opportunity Program. In addition, strong consideration should be given to the incorporation of Educational Opportunity Centers within appropriate urban community colleges and with appropriate funding arrangements.

F. Terms of Local Trustees

Local boards of trustees have uniformly served the needs of both their colleges and their communities with great dedication

and skill. The amount of time and effort they have expended on behalf of these institutions has been considerable. At various times, however, there have been suggestions that both the length and number of terms of local trustees be limited in some way to achieve the greatest possible participation by citizens in the affairs of the college. In addition, it has also been suggested that a mandatory retirement age be instituted.

In support of these proposals, it has been asserted that shorter terms would provide a more effective method for achieving and assuring greater responsiveness to the wishes of both the sponsors and the community at large. The impetus for examination of this question was provided by legislation introduced in 1975 which would have limited the terms of trustees at Onondaga Community College to three years. That legislation passed both houses but was subsequently vetoed by the Governor. In view of this, the Committee has reexamined this entire question. It is clear from existing evidence that neither length of service nor age determine the effectiveness and responsiveness of local trustees. In fact, it may not be possible to achieve maximum effectiveness as a Trustee if terms are significantly shortened. Nevertheless, more information on trustees will undoubtedly be requested by various oversight agencies and other interested groups in this era of increased accountability. Therefore, a trustee questionnaire has been prepared, and responses have been solicited on a voluntary basis.

Proposed Recommendation

This Committee strongly recommends that no changes be considered in either the duration or number of terms of local trustees

and that no mandatory retirement age be instituted.

G. Capital Chargebacks

Currently, capital chargeback monies can be utilized for four approved purposes, all related specifically to capital construction budgets. With the moratorium on capital construction, many institutions now find themselves with accumulated dollars which they cannot use. Their equipment needs, however, must continue to be met. At the same time, prospects for obtaining the necessary fifty percent matching state funds which would permit these dollars to be used for the purchase of capital equipment are slim. It would be most helpful if community colleges could utilize their chargeback reserves on a one hundred percent basis to finance equipment costs. To do this it would be necessary to add a fifth approved purpose to the four already identified in the Code of Standards and Procedures. A possible description of this purpose might be, "to provide the total cost for such capital equipment expenditures as may be necessary for the maintenance and improvement of the educational program, in an annual equipment additional budget which shall be appended to the operating budget or approved or amended in like manner as that budget." Such a procedure would provide maximum flexibility to local colleges and would make the most optimum use of available resources.

Proposed Recommendation

It is therefore recommended that necessary steps be undertaken to add a fifth approved purpose for the use of capital construction monies to the Code of Standards and Procedures.

H. Administrative Actions

As a result of its deliberations, the Committee has become aware of the need to provide additional information to assist local campuses in several areas. To this end, guidelines for presidential search committees have been developed by the Office for Community Colleges and are attached in the Appendix. The Committee supports this development and encourages the use of such guidelines.

Also, several institutions have indicated their desire for a finance manual to assist them in the budget process. The Office for Finance and Business is in the process of developing such a manual, and the Committee believes that this will be most useful to the campuses when it is completed. In response to campus requests, the Office for Community Colleges is also currently in the process of developing a management information system for collective bargaining purposes. The Committee supports this approach.

Proposed Recommendation

The Committee strongly supports the development of guidelines for presidential search committees, the preparation of a finance manual, and the development of a management information system for collective bargaining purposes. It recommends that appropriate action be taken to implement the presidential search guidelines.

I. Items for Future Attention

The focus of the Committee has been on the development of specific recommendations which can be implemented at the present

time. At the same time, however, several areas of concern have emerged which are deserving of further attention but where, for a variety of reasons, actions must necessarily be delayed. Discussions should be continued on the following subject areas:

(1) Mandatory Service Area Policy - Despite the rapid growth of community colleges in this State, significant portions of the State remain unserved by either a community college or a state-operated institution. The State University Trustees attempted to deal with this problem by promulgating a service area policy. This policy is voluntary in nature, and the provision of educational services necessarily depends on the willingness of presently unserved counties to enter into these agreements. A mandatory policy would undoubtedly be much more effective and equitable since services would be guaranteed throughout the entire State. Present voluntary arrangements should be encouraged. However, if after a reasonable time the problem has not been resolved, then legislation mandating such agreements should be sought.

(2) Regional Admissions to High Demand Programs - Currently, colleges which offer high demand programs, such as dental hygiene, often restrict admissions to students who are residents of the sponsorship area. As the approval process for new programs becomes more difficult in view of fiscal exigencies, the result may very well be the "freezing out" of opportunities for study in these

programs for students residing in certain sections of the State. This is clearly both unfair and not in the best long-term interests of the State. Therefore, consideration should be given to the development of regional admission policies in certain programs. The Committee recognizes that such admissions will require both educational and fiscal considerations, including such delicate matters as appropriate charge-back considerations and the ability of the local sponsor to restrict admissions to local residents. Nevertheless, the possibility of regional admissions should continue to be explored.

(3) Center on Community College Studies - One of the most effective means for providing system-wide assistance to community colleges would be the sponsorship of a center on community college studies at an appropriate university center campus. However, the Committee recognizes that the present fiscal climate precludes such an approach this year. Nevertheless, this should be viewed as a goal over the long term.

(4) Tuition - The Committee remains committed to the concept of reasonable tuition as the best method of guaranteeing opportunity to all citizens. Full-time tuition currently cannot exceed either one-third of net operating costs or the full-time tuition of $650 charged at state-operated institutions, whichever is less. There has

been no comparable policy issued for part-time students, and as a result, tuition for the part-time student varies significantly from campus to campus. For example, at the state-operated institutions, part-time tuition is 1/30 of full-time tuition or $21.50 per credit hour. At community colleges, the Board has authorized maximum part-time tuition of 1/24 of $650 or $27 per credit hour. As the number of hours required for completion of a program increases, the cost to the part-time student increases dramatically. An analysis of 1975-76 tuition and fee schedule illustrating this phenomenon is included in the Appendix.

While a case can be made for the proposition that the administrative costs of processing and counseling part-time students are greater per credit hour than those for their full-time counterparts, part-time tuition has often been pushed to the maximum as a ready source of income for the colleges. While it would not be reasonable to promulgate a policy which would result in increased financial burdens on local colleges at this time, a policy on part-time tuition should be developed in the days ahead.

III. CONCLUSION

The community colleges have been, and will continue to be, in the forefront of the most significant recent developments in postsecondary education. They have extended the opportunity for higher education to a mass population, and their contribution today to nontraditional clientele through programs of open admissions, prisoner education, noncredit instruction and community service cannot be overestimated.

Business, industry, labor and government all require and will continue to require the trained manpower produced by the community colleges. The opening to lifelong learning provided by these institutions to an ever-increasing proportion of the population will be a basic element of a healthy and open society in the decades ahead.

Progress in the community college movement came fairly easily during the sixties and the early years of this decade. Continued progress in a time of an uncertain economy, finite resources, and enrollment uncertainties and fluctuations, will provide a stern test to the resolve of both individual colleges and the system at large.

This committee is committed to the concept of vital and healthy community colleges in this State and believes that the challenges of today will be met.

APPENDIX

Figure 1

FORMULA ON LIMITATIONS

BASIC AID CEILINGS*

	1975-76	PROPOSED 1976-77
FULL OPPORTUNITY COLLEGES	$670/FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT	$644/FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT
NON-FULL OPPORTUNITY COLLEGES	~~$558~~ ~~$500~~/FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT	$537/FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT

*Up to 40% of Net Operating Costs for Full-Opportunity Colleges
or 33 1/3% of Net Operating Costs for Non-Full Opportunity Students

Plus

40% of Rental Cost for Physical Space for Full-Opportunity Colleges
and 33 1/3% for Physical Space for Non-Full Opportunity Colleges

Supplemental State Aid

$150/FTE student
enrolled in non-business
technical programs

FORMULA ON LIMITATIONS

ADDITIONAL INCREMENTS TO THE STATE AID CEILING

FOR MEETING STATE PRIORITIES

	NON-FULL OPPORTUNITY COLLEGES		FULL OPPORTUNITY COLLEGES	
	1975-76	1976-77	1975-76	1976-77
1. STUDENT-FACULTY RATIO OF AT LEAST 18.0 TO 1 (1975-76) 18.5 TO 1 (1976-77)	$29/FTE	$29/FTE	$35/FTE	$35/FTE
2. INSTRUCTIONAL BUDGET OF AT LEAST 50% OF NET COSTS	$29/FTE	ABOLISH	$35/FTE	ABOLISH
3. MINIMUM TAX EFFORT OF .5 MILL	$29/FTE	ABOLISH	$35/FTE	ABOLISH
4. DISADVANTAGED STUDENT INCREMENT IF ENROLLMENT PROPORTIONAL TO TOTAL POPULATION	$150*	$150*	$180*	$180*
	*EACH FULL-TIME DISADVANTAGED STUDENT		*EACH FULL-TIME DISADVANTAGED STUDENT	

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The thirty community colleges operating under the program of the State University of New York are located throughout the State and offer an array of comprehensive programs, both of two years' duration and less, in occupational, technical and liberal education, leading toward the conferring of associate degrees, diplomas and certificates. These diversified community colleges, under local sponsorship and jointly governed by the State University Board of Trustees and the colleges' local trustees, serve both local and statewide interests by providing an opportunity for low tuition, quality education, primarily on a commuting basis, to a broad cross section of the citizens of New York State.

More specifically, the State University Trustees have defined the mission of these institutions to be to:

(1) Provide career education including occupational, vocational, technical and semi-technical fields, designed to provide job training for immediate entry into a career field, retraining, and/or upgrading of skills to meet individual, local and State manpower needs.

(2) Provide the first two years of a baccalaureate-parallel education designed to prepare students for transfer to four-year colleges and universities.

(3) Provide general studies, including preparatory or developmental instruction, adult basic education and general education designed to meet individual educational goals.

(4) Continue and expand the policy of open-access along with an outreach program to meet the needs of non-traditional students, such as the culturally disadvantaged and adults of all ages.

(5) Provide student support services designed to achieve maximum individual potential, including but not limited to, admissions, a cocurricular educational program, counseling, testing, tutoring, placement and special assistance for disadvantaged students.

(6) Offer a variety of noncredit community service courses for both career purposes and self-development.

(7) Provide public service activities of an educational nature which may include workshops, seminars and community forums along with opportunities for cultural enrichment, both on an individual and community basis.

The role of the State University in this mission is to act as a statewide coordinating agency in providing general statewide planning and leadership for these institutions as defined in Article 126 of the Education Law. Under the Law, the State University Trustees have the responsibility for approving the establishment of a community college and its programs, curricula, and budgets, the appointment of the community college president, and for providing standards and regulations to guide and govern its operation.

The Community College Presidential Search Process

Introduction

Section 6306.2 of Article 126 of the Education Law indicates that the board of trustees of each community college shall appoint a president, subject to the approval of the University Trustees. Therefore, while the various college constituencies may join in the search for a president, it is the college trustees who make the final selection. The search is usually extensive, and the screening process may be both lengthy and complex. However, the end result is usually the best possible candidate for the college presidency.

Basic Considerations

First and foremost, the college trustees should take advantage of the presidential vacancy to do some personal and institutional soul searching. The leadership needs of any institution vary at different times in its history. Having decided where the institution is and where it is headed, the trustees can move on to the second phase which is to develop a reasonably detailed position description. Such a description is most helpful to potential candidates and, of course, is a source against which trustees can later measure a president's performance. The board of trustees may seek input from its various constituencies in developing this position description.

Search Committee

The composition of the presidential search committee is often detailed in institutional and/or faculty procedural policy statements. Generally, such a committee should include representation from the many college constituencies. Some such committees include representatives from the college's sponsoring body.

The committee should be given a specific charge in terms of what the board expects of them. Specifically, the committee needs to know such things as: the time frame within which they must work; position description; monies available to them for advertising, communications with candidates, travel and lodging provisions for both the committee visiting candidates and candidates visiting the campus; procedures for reporting progress to the board and the number of candidates to be referred to the board for final consideration. Above all, and as diplomatically as possible; the committee is to be reminded at the outset that its role is strictly advisory.

Advertising the Position

Internal promotion or reassignment may be given serious consideration, but caution should be exercised that the institution does not run counter to affirmative action laws or regulations.

Advertising may be quite extensive or limited depending on the desired audience to be reached, available time and budgetary restrictions. An honest approach to the needs and available resources of the institution will result in a more productive search. Such generalizations as "salary open" or "salary commensurate with credentials" are often misleading and indeed untrue. The same may be said of academic credentials and work experience. If absolutes have been established, the committee's work will be easier. This procedure may well result in fewer applications but those received will tend to be realistic candidates.

Search Procedure

Given the aforementioned, the search committee will want to develop a rating system to be used in measuring candidates against the position description. Oftentimes a search committee secretary will be appointed by the board. This person's chief responsibilities include collecting the candidates' credentials, reminding candidates of that which is necessary to make an application complete, making completed folders available to the search committee, taking minutes at committee meetings, acting as the correspondent for the search committee and later on, arranging interview dates, lodging and travel for presidential finalists. This person may be asked to assume this workload in addition to his/her regular assignment at the college, may be given released time from his/her regular assignment, may receive extra compensation for this work, or any combination thereof. More often than not, he/she is secretary or administrative assistant to the president and/or the college board.

Committee members often find it convenient to drop in to the secretary's office and examine a dozen or so completed folders at a time. By the time the closing date for applications has arrived, many folders will then have been examined, rated and made ready for processing. The committee will, of course, still want to meet periodically as a body, but much can be accomplished on an individual basis as time and work schedules permit.

As the rating system is applied, the number of viable candidates will be reduced to a number the committee will want to interview. This number is normally no fewer than a half dozen and no more than a dozen. From this group usually three are referred to the college board for final consideration. These numbers vary depending on the directions from the local college board of trustees.

When the committee has referred the appropriate number of candidates to the college board, they have for all intents and purposes completed their assignment.

Evaluating Credentials

Search committees will want to develop some system to evaluate/rate candidates. Usually a number system (1-10) can be applied to various aspects of the candidate's credentials. Given 10 as the highest score a candidate can attain, the committee can then decide what their various cut-off points will be. For instance, those with a cumulative score (each committee member rating each candidate) of seven (7) or more might be considered as reasonable candidates for the presidential position; those with scores of 5 & 6 might require another look-see, and those below 5 might be set aside as unlikely candidates. Those in this latter category should be so advised as early as possible.

References

Normally, candidates are asked to supply the search committee with the names of those people who have a working knowledge of the candidate in matters relating to the position in question. The committee should reserve the right to contact any and all who might contribute to their (the committee's) deliberations. Common courtesy dictates that this procedure be made clear to the candidates.

Home Site Visitations

There is little evidence to support the position that much can be gleaned from a visit to the candidate's present or previous work environment. Most of the exploring can be accomplished via letter and telephone with the candidate's references or related associates, or by direct contact with the candidate in an interview session. Rather than asking the references to deal in generalities, the search committee might develop a list of specifics to which they would like answers.

The Role of State University of New York - Central Staff

To assist the campus in its efforts and so that in good conscience the Chancellor can recommend a presidential candidate to the State University of New York Board, the Chancellor's designee should be brought into the search procedure at the earliest possible opportunity.

The files of the Office of Community Colleges contain material related to all phases of the presidential search. This, along with the expertise gained over the years, should prove helpful if indeed not invaluable to campuses embarking on a presidential search.

In each instance, the Chancellor will designate someone from his staff to assist the campus with their presidential search. The campuses are encouraged to utilize this person particularly at the outset when guidelines and procedures are being developed and again when the search committee has narrowed its list down to those whom it expects to interview. Having mutually agreed to a list of those to be interviewed, the Chancellor's representative may request to be present when any or all of the candidates appear before the committee. This is important so that finalists can be recommended to the State University of New York Board with a degree of authority! The Board meets monthly September - June.

Final Recommendation and Subsequent Approval

Generally, the search committee refers three candidates to the college board of trustees. The committee is not encouraged to rank these candidates but rather indicate that any of the three would be acceptable as president of the institution.

In the event that any of the three withdraws from consideration, another candidate should be added in that person's place.

If the college board of trustees finds none of the finalists acceptable, they may ask for additional names. If none of the alternates prove acceptable, the board may discharge the committee and begin again.

Assuming that the college board does select one of the three finalists, they should do so in resolution form, indicating the name of the person to be appointed, when that person is to begin his/her duties and the salary assigned to the candidate. The resolution should include the phrase, "subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York."

Finally, a letter from the chairperson of the college board of trustees should be addressed to the Chancellor, State University of New York, indicating the action taken by the local board, the names of the two alternates (credentials on all three finalists are to be appended), and a request that the Chancellor present the candidate for approval to the State University of New York Board of Trustees.

The Chancellor's representative then arranges for the presidential finalist to meet with the Chancellor and later, the State University of New York Board of Trustees.

A suggested flow chart on the presidential search process is attached.

Community College Presidential Search Process

1. Vacancy is determined
2. Search Committee is formed
3. Search Committee convenes
4. Charge given to Search Committee by college board*
5. Search Committee elects chairperson* and secretary*
6. Meeting schedule determined
7. Timetable is developed*
8. Job description developed*
9. Advertising sources considered
10. Position is posted
11. Rating system determined
12. Applications arrive
13. Letters of acknowledgement go out
14. Formal review by individual committee members
15. Committee meets - "no" letters sent to weak candidates
16. Committee again examines credentials considered "potential." Additional "no" letters sent.
17. Interviews of strong candidates
18. References checked
19. Finalists selected, referred to college board
20. Board interviews - if desired/necessary
21. Final evaluation of finalists by college board
22. Job offer made
23. If candidate accepts offer, announcements sent to other finalists.
24. SUNY Board of Trustees approved candidate appointed by college board.
25. Search process is completed.

*If not specified by college board

Table 1

ESTIMATED STATE AID TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES*

Under Current Formula 1975-76 and Executive Budget Recommendations 1976-77

(College Fiscal Years)

College	FTE 1975-76	Total State Aid 1975-76	State Aid Per FTE 1975-76	FTE 1976-77	Total State Aid 1976-77	State Aid Per FTE 1976-77	State Aid as a Percentage of Net Operating Costs 1975-76	State Aid as a Percentage of Net Operating Costs 1976-77
Adirondack	1,350	$ 1,063,000	$787	1,370	$ 952,000	$695	41.5	35.3
Broome	3,505	2,858,000	815	3,665	2,699,000	736	43.1	37.3
Cayuga County	2,290	1,864,000	814	2,350	1,687,000	718	39.8	35.4
Clinton	950	749,000	788	970	694,000	715	32.1	29.0
Columbia-Greene	725	536,000	739	800	569,000	711	26.7	25.0
Community College of The Finger Lakes	1,490	1,251,000	840	1,695	1,256,000	741	35.9	33.6
Corning	2,485	2,314,000	931	2,735	2,284,000	835	42.2	37.8
Dutchess	3,600	3,037,000	844	3,830	2,865,000	748	36.8	30.3
Erie - City	1,290	959,000	743	1,310	958,000	731	35.6	32.3
Erie - North	6,355	4,641,000	730	5,850	3,878,000	663	38.5	33.0
Erie - South	1,465	726,000	496	2,095	1,010,000	482	36.3	35.4
Fashion Institute	4,260	3,609,000	847	4,255	3,197,000	751	24.3	20.0
Fulton-Montgomery	1,465	1,205,000	823	1,455	1,105,000	759	29.1	26.0

College	FTE 1975-76	Total State Aid 1975-76	State Aid Per FTE 1975-76	FTE 1976-77	Total State Aid 1976-77	State Aid Per FTE 1976-77	State Aid as a Percentage of Net Operating Costs 1975-76	State Aid as a Percentage of Net Operating Costs 1976-77
enesee	2,345	$ 2,159,000	$921	2,435	$ 2,008,000	$825	38.3	33.6
erkimer County	1,285	1,053,000	819	1,305	981,000	752	40.5	38.5
udson Valley	5,715	4,875,000	853	6,000	4,532,000	755	39.8	32.9
amestown	2,445	2,031,000	831	2,465	1,852,000	751	42.9	36.8
efferson	1,205	980,000	813	1,250	945,000	756	39.1	32.9
ohawk Valley	4,710	3,890,000	826	4,735	3,608,000	762	44.0	39.8
onroe	7,570	6,315,000	834	7,590	5,589,000	736	37.5	30.4
assau	14,750	9,510,000	645	14,900	9,617,000	645	37.1	33.1
iagara County	3,870	3,104,000	802	3,765	2,791,000	741	36.9	32.1
orth Country	965	768,000	796	1,035	725,000	700	32.9	28.0
nondaga	4,330	3,634,000	839	4,805	3,566,000	742	39.4	29.3
range County	4,075	3,223,000	791	4,020	2,793,000	695	33.1	27.4
ockland	6,050	4,871,000	805	6,220	4,442,000	714	41.2	35.4
chenectady County	1,565	1,198,000	765	1,635	1,227,000	750	38.1	38.2
uffolk - Eastern	- 0 -	133,000	-0-	910	800,000	879	40.0	41.1
uffolk - Selden	11,000	7,889,000	717	10,090	7,319,000	725	41.7	37.2
uffolk - Western	1,880	1,417,000	754	2,620	1,948,000	744	41.6	37.9
ullivan County	1,590	1,315,000	827	1,600	1,226,000	766	29.4	26.5

College	FTE 1975-76	Total State Aid 1975-76	State Aid Per FTE 1975-76	FTE 1976-77	Total State Aid 1976-77	State Aid Per FTE 1976-77	State Aid as a Percentage of Net Operating Costs 1975-76	State Aid as a Percentage o Net Operatin Costs 1976-77
Tompkins-Cortland	1,715	1,380,000	805	1,960	1,458,000	744	38.4	35.9
Ulster County	2,220	1,885,000	849	2,375	1,774,000	747	35.0	28.5
Westchester	6,005	4,444,000	740	5,925	4,308,000	727	37.6	36.9
Totals	116,520	90,886,000	780**	120,020	$86,663,000	722**	37.4%	32.6**

*1975-76 Data is revised as of 10/21/75
1976-77 Data based on the Executive Budget

** Weighted Averages

1/29/76

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TUITION, 1975-76

College	Tuition Full-time	Tuition Per Credit Hour	Cost to Full-time Student 30 Credit Hours	Cost to Part-time Student 30 Credit Hours	Percent Difference	Cost to Full-time Student 34 Credit Hours	Cost to Part-time Student 34 Credit Hours	Percent Difference
Adirondack	$580	$20.00	$580	$600	+ 3.4%	$580	$680	+18.2%
Broome	650	25.00	650	750	+15.4%	650	850	+30.8%
Cayuga County	600	20.00	600	600	------	600	680	+13.3%
Clinton	590	21.50	590	645	+ 9.3%	590	731	+23.9%
Columbia-Greene	600	25.00	600	750	+25.0%	600	850	+41.7%
Finger Lakes	600	25.00	600	750	+25.0%	600	850	+41.7%
Corning	600	25.00	600	750	+25.0%	600	850	+41.7%
Dutchess	650	22.00	650	660	+ 1.5%	650	748	+15.1%
Erie	640	22.00	640	660	+ 3.1%	640	748	+16.9%
Fulton-Montgomery	600	22.00	600	660	+10.0%	600	748	+24.7%
Genesee	590	20.00	590	600	+ 1.7%	590	680	+11.9%
Herkimer County	490	21.00	490	630	+28.6%	490	714	+45.7%
Hudson Valley	600	27.00	600	810	+35.0%	600	918	+53.0%
Jamestown	550	18.50	550	555	+ .9%	550	629	+14.4%
Jefferson	650	27.00	650	810	+24.6%	650	918	+41.2%
Mohawk Valley**	600	21.00	600	630	+ 5.0%	600	714	+19.0%
State-Operated Institutions Lower Division	650	21.50	650	645	(.8%)	650	731	+12.5%

College	Tuition Full-time	Tuition Per Credit Hour	Cost to Full-time Student 30 Credit Hours	Cost to Part-time Student 30 Credit Hours	Percent Difference	Cost to Full-time Student 34 Credit Hours	Cost to Part-time Student 34 Credit Hours	Percent Differen
Monroe	$650	$27.00	$650	$810	+24.6%	$650	$918	+41.2%
Nassau								
Fall	540	18.00	540	540	------	540	612	+13.3%
Spring	630	23.00	630	690	+ 9.5%	630	782	+24.1%
Niagara County	650	27.00	650	810	+24.6%	650	918	+41.2%
North Country	600	20.00	600	600	------	600	680	+13.3%
Onondaga	650	25.00	650	750	+15.4%	650	850	+30.8%
Orange County	650	25.00	650	750	+15.4%	650	850	+30.8%
Rockland	600	25.00	600	750	+25.0%	600	850	+41.7%
Schenectady County**	420	18.00***	420	540	+28.6%	420	612	+45.7%
Suffolk County	510	20.00	510	600	+17.6%	510	680	+33.3%
Sullivan County	650	27.00	650	810	+24.6%	650	918	+41.2%
Tompkins-Cortland	600	20.00	600	600	------	600	680	+13.3%
Ulster County	650	23.00	650	690	+ 6.2%	650	782	+20.3%
Westchester	600	25.00	600	750	+25.0%	600	850	+41.7%
State-Operated Institutions								
Lower Division	650	21.50	650	645	(.8%)	650	731	+12.5%

*Exclusive of the Fashion Institute which charges part-time tuition according to clock hour
**Operates on the Quarter System
***Constructed Tuition Per Credit Hour

PRELIMINARY CREDIT COURSE ENROLLMENT, FALL 1975
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Institution	Total			Undergraduate			Graduate		
	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time
State University total	354,998	231,282	123,716	313,668	215,639	98,029	41,330	15,643	25,687
State-operated institutions	200,549	148,326	52,223	159,219	132,683	26,536	41,330	15,643	25,687
University Centers	64,496	46,889	17,607	45,900	38,922	6,978	18,596	7,967	10,629
Albany	15,447	11,245	4,202	10,453	9,325	1,128	4,994	1,920	3,074
Binghamton	9,695	7,530	2,165	7,195	6,457	738	2,500	1,073	1,427
Buffalo	24,505	17,718	6,787	18,330	14,282	4,048	6,175	3,436	2,739
Stony Brook	14,849	10,396	4,453	9,922	8,858	1,064	4,927	1,538	3,389
University Colleges	89,698	64,919	24,779	73,516	62,754	10,762	16,182	2,165	14,017
Brockport	11,696	8,818	2,878	9,366	8,484	1,082	2,130	334	1,796
Buffalo	12,604	8,772	3,832	10,029	8,513	1,516	2,575	259	2,316
Cortland	6,075	5,026	1,049	4,953	4,804	149	1,122	222	900
Empire State	3,537	1,586	1,951	3,537	1,586	1,951	-	-	-
Fredonia	5,233	3,961	1,272	4,350	3,839	511	883	122	761
Geneseo	6,374	5,116	1,258	5,183	4,825	358	1,191	291	900
New Paltz	8,892	5,091	3,801	5,898	4,821	1,077	2,994	270	2,724
Old Westbury	1,875	1,351	524	1,875	1,351	524	-	-	-
Oneonta	6,264	5,292	972	5,394	5,116	278	870	176	694
Oswego	9,730	7,810	1,920	8,070	7,605	465	1,660	205	1,455
Plattsburgh	6,720	5,299	1,421	5,626	5,125	501	1,094	174	920
Potsdam	5,021	4,148	873	4,173	4,036	137	848	112	736
Purchase	2,749	1,749	1,000	2,749	1,749	1,000	-	-	-
Utica/Rome	2,928	900	2,028	2,113	900	1,213	815	-	815

75/762-1
cjr

PRELIMINARY CREDIT COURSE ENROLLMENT, FALL 1975
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
(Continued)

Institution	Total			Undergraduate			Graduate		
	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time
Health Sciences Centers	6,418	5,608	810	2,340	2,157	183	4,078	3,451	627
Buffalo	2,683	2,166	517	900	784	116	1,783	1,382	401
Downstate	1,468	1,425	43	446	429	17	1,022	996	26
Stony Brook	1,261	1,092	169	593	560	33	668	532	136
Upstate	1,006	925	81	401	384	17	605	541	64
Specialized Colleges	3,626	2,971	655	2,876	2,628	248	750	343	407
Environmental Science and Forestry	2,491	2,012	479	2,039	1,793	246	452	219	233
Maritime	1,004	851	153	837	835	2	167	16	151
Optometry	131	108	23	-	-	-	131	108	23
Statutory Colleges	6,882	6,842	40	5,158	5,125	33	1,724	1,717	7
Agriculture and Life Sciences	3,938	3,938	-	2,929	2,929	-	1,009	1,009	-
Ceramics	570	530	40	511	478	33	59	52	7
Human Ecology	1,348	1,348	-	1,126	1,126	-	222	222	-
Industrial and Labor Relations	695	695	-	592	592	-	103	103	-
Veterinary Medicine	331	331	-	-	-	-	331	331	-

75/762-2
cjr

PRELIMINARY CREDIT COURSE ENROLLMENT, FALL 1975
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
(Continued)

Institution	Total			Undergraduate			Graduate		
	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time
Agricultural and Technical Colleges	29,429	21,097	8,332	29,429	21,097	8,332	-	-	-
Alfred	4,386	4,086	300	4,386	4,086	300	-	-	-
Canton	2,834	2,402	432	2,834	2,402	432	-	-	-
Cobleskill	2,761	2,600	161	2,761	2,600	161	-	-	-
Delhi	2,755	2,559	196	2,755	2,559	196	-	-	-
Farmingdale	13,642	6,793	6,849	13,642	6,793	6,849	-	-	-
Morrisville	3,051	2,657	394	3,051	2,657	394	-	-	-
Community Colleges	154,449	82,956	71,493	154,449	82,956	71,493	-	-	-
Adirondack	1,809	1,027	782	1,809	1,027	782	-	-	-
Broome	4,753	2,724	2,029	4,753	2,724	2,029	-	-	-
Cayuga County	3,306	1,704	1,602	3,306	1,704	1,602	-	-	-
Clinton	1,276	659	617	1,276	659	617	-	-	-
Columbia-Greene	1,022	552	470	1,022	552	470	-	-	-
Community College of the Finger Lakes	2,170	1,129	1,041	2,170	1,129	1,041	-	-	-
Corning	2,702	2,093	609	2,702	2,093	609	-	-	-
Dutchess	5,423	2,570	2,853	5,423	2,570	2,853	-	-	-
Erie	11,105	6,162	4,943	11,105	6,162	4,943	-	-	-
Fashion Institute	6,575	2,663	3,912	6,575	2,663	3,912	-	-	-
Fulton-Montgomery	1,701	1,093	608	1,701	1,093	608	-	-	-
Genesee	2,599	1,713	886	2,599	1,713	886	-	-	-

75/762-3
cjr

PRELIMINARY CREDIT COURSE ENROLLMENT, FALL 1975
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
(Continued)

Institution	Total			Undergraduate			Graduate		
	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Full-time	Part-time
Community Colleges (continued)									
Herkimer County	1,439	1,115	324	1,439	1,115	324	-	-	-
Hudson Valley	7,006	4,828	2,178	7,006	4,828	2,178	-	-	-
Jamestown	3,267	1,724	1,543	3,267	1,724	1,543	-	-	-
Jefferson	1,524	991	533	1,524	991	533	-	-	-
Mohawk Valley	6,586	3,131	3,455	6,586	3,131	3,455	-	-	-
Monroe	10,350	5,498	4,852	10,350	5,498	4,852	-	-	-
Nassau	17,555	10,144	7,411	17,555	10,144	7,411	-	-	-
Niagara County	4,649	3,195	1,454	4,649	3,195	1,454	-	-	-
North Country	1,275	682	593	1,275	682	593	-	-	-
Onondaga	5,828	3,017	2,811	5,826	3,017	2,811	-	-	-
Orange County	5,253	2,502	2,751	5,253	2,502	2,751	-	-	-
Rockland	8,238	3,935	4,303	8,238	3,935	4,303	-	-	-
Schenectady County	2,924	954	1,970	2,924	954	1,970	-	-	-
Suffolk County	18,537	8,735	9,802	18,537	8,735	9,802	-	-	-
Sullivan County	1,740	1,403	337	1,740	1,403	337	-	-	-
Tompkins-Cortland	2,784	1,197	1,587	2,784	1,197	1,587	-	-	-
Ulster County	2,803	1,566	1,237	2,803	1,566	1,237	-	-	-
Westchester	8,250	4,250	4,000	8,250	4,250	4,000	-	-	-

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
MAR 4 1977

75/762-4
cjr

Central Staff Office of Institutional Research
State University of New York · October 31, 1975